Document: 12

Page: 1

Filed: 12/21/2017

Form 26 Rev. 10/16

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT

	No. 18	3-1213		
	Ashford University, LLC			
		v.		
	Secretary of Veterans Af	fairs		
	DOCE	KETING STAT	EMENT	
of docketing. When th	te United States or its sel and filed with the co	officer or agency	nd filed with the court withing is a party, this Docketing ys of docketing. All question	Statement must be
Name of the party you re	present Ashford Univer	sity, LLC		
Party is (select one)	⊠ Appellar	nt/Petitioner	Cross-Appellan	t
	Appellee	e/Respondent	☐ Intervenor	
Tribunal appealed from a	and Case No. Dept.	of Veteran Affairs,	Muskogee Regional Benefit Off	ice
Date of Judgment/Order	November 9, 2017	Type of Case	Veteran's Benefits	
Relief sought on appeal	Vacatur of unlawful an	d/or ultra vires age	ency action	
Relief awarded below (if o	lamages, specify) N/A			
Briefly describe the judgi	ment/order appealed from	The director of the	e regional benefit office, acting	pursuant to authority
	ary, informed Ashford of l w enrollments and reenro		uspend payment of educational l University."	assistance and
Nature of judgment (selec	et one)			
☐ Final Judgment	, 28 USC 1295			
☐ Rule 54(b)				
☐ Interlocutory O	rder (specify type)			
⊠ Other (explain;	see Fed. Cir. R. 28(a)(5))	Respondent's cha	llenged action adopts or reflects	s previously
		gal rules, and is th	erefore "[a]n action of the Secre	tary to which

FORM 26. Docketing Statement Rev. 10/16 Name and docket number of any related cases pending before this court plus the name of the writing judge if an opinion was issued. If none, please state none.					
Name and docket number of any related cases pending before this court plus the name of the writing judge if an opinion was issued.					
- INI					
n none, prease state none.					
Brief statement of the issues to be raised on appeal Whether VA's decision:					
Whether vas decision.					
(1) improperly amends VA's regulations without following mandatory procedures; (2) adopts an arbitrary and capricious definition of the term "main campus" in 38 C.F.R. § 21.4250; and (3) is not in accordance with law because it attempts to exercise "supervision or control" over a state agency responsible for approving GI Bill benefits, contrary to 38 U.S.C. § 3682.					
Have there been discussions with other parties relating to settlement of this case? Yes No If "yes," when					
were the last such discussions?					
☐ Before the case was filed below?					
During the pendency of the case below?					
Following the judgment/order appealed from?					
If "yes," were the settlement discussions mediated? \square Yes \square No					
If they were mediated, by whom?					
Do you believe that this case may be amenable to mediation? $\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \$					
Please explain why you believe the case is or is not amenable to mediation.					
VA's decision reflects the agency's firm adoption of legal rules that are, in Ashford's understanding, both procedurally and substantively unlawful. Ashford sees no realistic prospect that VA would retreat from those positions absent an adverse judgment.					
Provide any other information relevant to the inclusion of this case in the court's mediation program.					
l de la companya de					

Case: 18-1213 FORM 26. Docketing Statement

Document: 12

Page: 3 Filed: 12/21/2017

Form 26 Rev. 10/16

		this Docketing Statement served a copy on counsel		d States Court of Appeals for the			
21st		day of December		2017			
by:	CM/ECF			,			
		(manner of service)					
Carter G. Phillips /s/ Carter G. Phillips							
	Nai	ne of Counsel		Signature of Counsel			
Lav	w Firm	Sidley Austin LLP					
Add	lress	1501 K Street NW					
City,	, State, ZIP	Washington, DC 2000	5				
Telepl	hone Number	202-736-8000					
FAX	Number	202-736-8711					
E-ma	il Address	cphillips@sidley.com					
			Reset Fields				